

Chapter I: Overview of this Plan and its Development

1 Introduction

This Wildland-Urban Interface Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan for Ada County, Idaho, is the result of analyses, professional cooperation and collaboration, assessments of wildfire risks and other factors considered with the intent to reduce the potential for wildfires to threaten people, structures, infrastructure, and unique ecosystems in Ada County, Idaho. The planning team responsible for implementing this project was led by the Ada County Commissioners. Agencies and organizations that participated in the planning process included:

- Ada City-County Emergency Management (ACCEM)
- Ada County Assessors Office & GIS Analyst
- Ada County Commissioners
- Ada County Communications
- Ada County Emergency Medical Services
- Ada County Engineer
- Ada County Highway Districts
- Ada County Sheriff
- Boise Airport
- Boise City Fire Department
- Boise City Public Works
- Boise Planning
- Boise Police Department
- Bureau of Land Management
- City of Eagle
- City of Garden City
- City of Kuna
- City of Meridian
- City of Star
- Central District Health Department
- Department of Veteran's Affairs, VA Medical Center
- Eagle Fire District
- Garden City Police Department
- Idaho Department of Lands
- Idaho Fish and Game
- Kuna Fire District
- Kuna Planning and Zoning
- Melba Fire Department
- Meridian Fire Department
- Meridian Wastewater Treatment Plant
- North Ada County Fire and Rescue
- Northwest Management, Inc.
- Saint Alphonsus Regional Medical Center
- Southwest Idaho Resource Conservation and Development Council
- Star Joint Fire Protection District
- St. Luke's Regional Medical Center

The Southwest Idaho Resource Conservation and Development Council, Inc., on behalf of the Ada County Commissioners, solicited competitive bids from companies to provide the service of leading the assessment and the writing of the **Ada County Wildland-Urban Interface Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan**. The SW Idaho RC&D contracted with Northwest Management, Inc., to provide this service to Elmore, Ada and Canyon Counties. Northwest Management, Inc. is a professional natural resources consulting firm located in Moscow, Idaho. Established in 1984 NMI provides natural resource management services across the USA. The Project Manager from Northwest Management, Inc. was Dr. William E. Schlosser, a professional resource manager and regional planner.

1.1 Goals and Guiding Principles

1.1.1 Federal Emergency Management Agency Philosophy

Effective November 1, 2004, a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is required for Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) and Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM) eligibility. The HMGP and PDM program provide funding, through state emergency management agencies, to support local mitigation planning and projects to reduce potential disaster damages.

The new local hazard mitigation plan requirements for HMGP and PDM eligibility is based on the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, which amended the Stafford Disaster Relief Act to promote and integrated, cost effective approach to mitigation. Local hazard mitigation plans must meet the minimum requirements of the Stafford Act-Section 322, as outlined in the criteria contained in 44 CFR Part 201. The plan criteria cover the planning process, risk assessment, mitigation strategy, plan maintenance, and adoption requirements.

FEMA will only review a local hazard mitigation plan submitted through the appropriate State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO). Draft versions of local hazard mitigation plans will not be reviewed by FEMA. FEMA will review the final version of a plan prior to local adoption to determine if the plan meets the criteria, but FEMA will be unable to approve it prior to adoption. In Idaho the SHMO is:

Idaho Department of Homeland Security
4040 Guard Street, Bldg 600
Boise, ID 83705

A FEMA designed plan will be evaluated on its adherence to a variety of criteria.

- Adoption by the Local Governing Body
- Multi-jurisdictional Plan Adoption
- Multi-jurisdictional Planning Participation
- Documentation of Planning Process
- Identifying Hazards
- Profiling Hazard Events
- Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets
- Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses
- Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends
- Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment
- Local Hazard Mitigation Goals
- Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures
- Implementation of Mitigation Measures
- Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy

- Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan
- Implementation Through Existing Programs
- Continued Public Involvement

1.1.2 United States Government Accounting Office

1.1.2.1 Technology Assessment - April 2005 – “Protecting Structures and Improving Communications during Wildland Fires”

1.1.2.1.1 Why GAO Did This Study

Since 1984, wildland fires have burned an average of more than 850 homes each year in the United States and, because more people are moving into fire-prone areas bordering wildlands, the number of homes at risk is likely to grow. The primary responsibility for ensuring that preventative steps are taken to protect homes lies with homeowners and state and local governments, not the federal government. Although losses from wildland fires made up only 2 percent of all insured catastrophic losses from 1983 to 2002, fires can result in billions of dollars in damages.

Once a wildland fire starts, various parties can be mobilized to fight it, including federal, state, local, and tribal firefighting agencies and, in some cases, the military. The ability to communicate among all parties - known as interoperability - is essential but, as GAO reported previously, is hampered because different public safety agencies operate on different radio frequencies or use incompatible communications equipment.

GAO was asked to assess, among other issues, (1) measures that can help protect structures from wildland fires, (2) factors affecting use of protective measures, and (3) the role technology plays in improving firefighting agencies' ability to communicate during wildland fires.

1.1.2.1.2 What GAO Found

The two most effective measures for protecting structures from wildland fires are: (1) creating and maintaining a buffer, called defensible space, from 30 to 100 feet wide around a structure, where vegetation and other flammable objects are reduced or eliminated; and (2) using fire-resistant roofs and vents. In addition to roofs and vents, other technologies – such as fire-resistant windows and building materials, chemical agents, sprinklers, and geographic information systems mapping – can help in protecting structures and communities, but they play a secondary role.

Although protective measures are available, many property owners have not adopted them because of the time or expense involved, competing concerns such as aesthetics or privacy, misperceptions about wildland fire risks, and lack of awareness of their shared responsibility for fire protection. Federal, state, and local governments, as well as other organizations, are attempting to increase property owners' use of protective measures through education, direct monetary assistance, and laws requiring such measures. In addition, some insurance companies have begun to direct property owners in high risk areas to take protective steps.

Existing technologies, such as audio switches, can help link incompatible communication systems, and new technologies, such as software-defined radios, are being developed following common standards or with enhanced capabilities to overcome incompatibility barriers. Technology alone, however, cannot solve communications problems for those responding to wildland fires. Rather, planning and coordination among federal, state, and local public safety

agencies is needed to resolve issues such as which technologies to adopt, cost sharing, operating procedures, training, and maintenance. The Department of Homeland Security is leading federal efforts to improve communications interoperability across all levels of government. In addition to federal efforts, several states and local jurisdictions are pursuing initiatives to improve communications interoperability.

The GAO study specifically noted the actions taken by Ada County in the Boise foothills in its “Examples of Laws Requiring Protective Measures Adopted by Jurisdiction in Five States GAO Visited” (GAO-05-380 Wildland Fire Technologies Table 1 pg 53. The report states:

“The county has identified lands at high risk of wildland fire and, since 1997, has required homeowners in this area to maintain at least 50 feet of defensible space around new structures. New construction in the high-risk area must comply with additional requirements, including at least class B roofing materials; screened vents’ enclosed eaves; nonflammable gutters; and fire-resistant exterior walls, windows and decks.”

1.1.3 Additional State and Federal Guidelines Adopted

The Wildland-Urban Interface Wildfire Mitigation Plan component of this All Hazards Mitigation Plan will include compatibility with FEMA requirements while also adhering to the guidelines proposed in the National Fire Plan, the Idaho Statewide Implementation Plan, and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (2004). This Wildland-Urban Interface Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan has been prepared in compliance with:

- The National Fire Plan; A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan—May 2002.
- The Idaho Statewide Implementation Strategy for the National Fire Plan—July 2002.
- Healthy Forests Restoration Act (2004)
- The Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Region 10 guidelines for a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan as defined in 44 CFR parts 201 and 206, and as related to a fire mitigation plan chapter of a Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan.

“When implemented, the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy will contribute to reducing the risks of wildfire to communities and the environment by building collaboration at all levels of government.”

- The NFP 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy August 2001

The objective of combining these four complimentary guidelines is to facilitate an integrated wildland fire risk assessment, identify pre-hazard mitigation activities, and prioritize activities and efforts to achieve the protection of people, structures, the environment, and significant infrastructure in Ada County while facilitating new opportunities for pre-disaster mitigation funding and cooperation.

1.1.3.1 National Fire Plan

The goals of this Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Mitigation Plan include:

1. Improve Fire Prevention and Suppression
2. Reduce Hazardous Fuels

3. Restore Fire-Adapted Ecosystems
4. Promote Community Assistance

Its three guiding principles are:

1. Priority setting that emphasizes the protection of communities and other high-priority watersheds at-risk.
2. Collaboration among governments and broadly representative stakeholders
3. Accountability through performance measures and monitoring for results.

This Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Mitigation Plan fulfills the National Fire Plan's 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy and the Idaho Statewide Implementation Strategy for the National Fire Plan. The projects and activities recommended under this plan are in addition to other Federal, state, and private/corporate forest and rangeland management activities. The implementation plan does not alter, diminish, or expand the existing jurisdiction, statutory and regulatory responsibilities and authorities or budget processes of participating Federal, State, and tribal agencies.

By endorsing this implementation plan, all signed parties agree that reducing the threat of wildland fire to people, communities, and ecosystems will require:

- Maintaining firefighter and public safety as the highest priority during any fire event.
- A sustained, long-term and cost-effective investment of resources by all public and private parties, recognizing overall budget parameters affecting Federal, State, and local governments.
- A unified effort to implement the collaborative framework called for in the Strategy in a manner that ensures timely decisions at each level.
- Accountability for measuring and monitoring performance and outcomes, and a commitment to factoring findings into future decision making activities.
- The achievement of national goals through action at the local level with particular attention on the unique needs of cross-boundary efforts and the importance of funding on-the-ground activities.
- Communities and individuals in the wildland-urban interface to initiate personal stewardship and volunteer actions that will reduce wildland fire risks.
- Management activities, both in the wildland-urban interface and in at-risk areas across the broader landscape.
- Active forestland and rangeland management, including thinning that produces commercial or pre-commercial products, biomass removal and utilization, prescribed fire and other fuels reduction tools to simultaneously meet long-term ecological, economic, and community objectives.

The National Fire Plan identifies a three-tiered organization structure including 1) the local level, 2) state/regional and tribal level, and 3) the national level. This plan adheres to the collaboration and outcomes consistent with a local level plan. Local level collaboration involves participants with direct responsibility for management decisions affecting public and/or private land and resources, fire protection responsibilities, or entities with good working knowledge and interest in local resources. Participants in this planning process include local representatives from Federal and State agencies, local governments, landowners and other stakeholders, and community-based groups with a demonstrated commitment to achieving the strategy's four

goals. Existing resource advisory committees, watershed councils, or other collaborative entities may serve to achieve coordination at this level. Local involvement, expected to be broadly representative, is a primary source of planning, project prioritization, and resource allocation and coordination at the local level. The role of the private citizen is not to be underestimated, as their input and contribution to all phases of risk assessments, mitigation activities, and project implementation is greatly facilitated by their involvement.

1.1.3.2 Idaho Statewide Implementation Strategy

The Strategy adopted by the State of Idaho is to provide a framework for an organized and coordinated approach to the implementation of the National Fire Plan, specifically the national “10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan”.

Emphasis is on a collaborative approach at the following levels:

- County
- State

Within the State of Idaho, the Counties, with the assistance of State and Federal agencies and local expert advice, will develop a risk assessment and mitigation plan to identify local vulnerabilities to wildland fire. A Statewide group will provide oversight and prioritization as needed on a statewide scale.

This strategy is not intended to circumvent any work done to date and individual Counties should not delay implementing any National Fire Plan projects to develop this county plan. Rather, Counties are encouraged to identify priority needs quickly and begin whatever actions necessary to mitigate those vulnerabilities.

It is recognized that implementation activities such as; hazardous fuel treatment, equipment purchases, training, home owner education, community wildland fire mitigation planning, and other activities, will be occurring concurrently with this County wide planning effort.

1.1.3.2.1 County Wildland Fire Interagency Group

Each County within the state has been requested to write a Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan. These plans should contain at least the following five elements:

- 1) Documentation of the process used to develop the mitigation plan. How the plan was developed, who was involved and how the public was involved.
- 2) A risk assessment to identify vulnerabilities to wildfire in the wildland-urban interface (WUI).
- 3) A prioritized mitigation strategy that addresses each of the risks. Examples of these strategies could be: training for fire departments, public education, hazardous fuel treatments, equipment, communications, additional planning, new facilities, infrastructure improvements, code and/or ordinance revision, volunteer efforts, evacuation plans, etc.
- 4) A process for maintenance of the plan which will include monitoring and evaluation of mitigation activities
- 5) Documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the involved agencies. Basically a signature page of all involved officials.

This five-element plan is an abbreviated version of the FEMA mitigation plan and will begin to meet the requirements for that plan. To develop these plans each county should bring together

the following individuals, as appropriate for each county, to make up the County Wildland Fire Interagency Group. It is important that this group has representation from agencies with wildland fire suppression responsibilities:

- County Commissioners (Lead)
- Local Fire Chiefs
- Idaho Department of Lands representative
- USDA Forest Service representative
- USDI Bureau of Land Management representative
- US Fish and Wildlife representative
- Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Local Tribal leaders
- Bureau of Disaster Services
- LEPC Chairperson
- Resource Conservation and Development representative
- State Fish and Game representative
- Interested citizens and community leaders as appropriate
- Other officials as appropriate

Role of Resource Conservation and Development Councils (RC&D) If requested by the County Commissioners, the local RC&D's may be available to assist the County Commissioners in evaluating each County within their council area to determine if there is a wildland fire mitigation plan in place, or if a plan is currently in the development phase. If no plan is in place, the RC&D's, if requested, could be available to assist the Commissioners with the formation of the County Wildland Fire Interagency Group and/or to facilitate the development of wildland fire mitigation plan.

If a plan has been previously completed, the Commissioners will determine if the recommended five elements have been addressed. The Counties will provide a copy of the completed mitigation plan to the Idaho Department of Lands National Fire Plan Coordinator, which will include a contact list of individuals that developed the plan.

1.1.3.3 National Association of State Foresters

1.1.3.3.1 Identifying and Prioritizing Communities at Risk

This plan is written with the intent to provide the information necessary for decision makers (elected officials) to make informed decisions in order to prioritize projects across the entire county. These decisions may be made from within the council of Commissioners, or through the recommendations of ad hoc groups tasked with making prioritized lists of projects. It is not necessary to rank projects numerically, although that is one approach, rather it may be possible to rank them categorically (high priority set, medium priority set, and so forth) and still accomplish the goals and objectives set forth in this planning document.

The following was prepared by the National Association of State Foresters (NASF), June 27, 2003, and is included here as a reference for the identification of prioritizing treatments between communities.

Purpose: To provide national, uniform guidance for implementing the provisions of the “Collaborative Fuels Treatment” MOU, and to satisfy the requirements of Task e, Goal 4 of the Implementation Plan for the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy.

Intent: The intent is to establish broad, nationally compatible standards for identifying and prioritizing communities at risk, while allowing for maximum flexibility at the state and regional level. Three basic premises are:

- Include all lands and all ownerships.
- Use a collaborative process that is consistent with the complexity of land ownership patterns, resource management issues, and the number of interested stakeholders.
- Set priorities by evaluating projects, not by ranking communities.

The National Association of State Foresters (NASF) set forth the following guidelines in the Final Draft Concept Paper; Communities at Risk, December 2, 2002.

Task: Develop a definition for “communities at risk” and a process for prioritizing them, per the Implementation Plan for the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy (Goal 4.e.). In addition, this definition will form the foundation for the NASF commitment to annually identify priority fuels reduction and ecosystem restoration projects in the proposed MOU with the federal agencies (section C.2 (b)).

1.1.3.3.2 Conceptual Approach

1. NASF fully supports the definition of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) previously published in the Federal Register. Further, proximity to federal lands should not be a consideration. The WUI is a set of conditions that exists on, or near, areas of wildland fuels nation-wide, regardless of land ownership.
2. Communities at risk (or, alternately, landscapes of similar risk) should be identified on a state-by-state basis with the involvement of all agencies with wildland fire protection responsibilities: state, local, tribal, and federal.
3. It is neither reasonable nor feasible to attempt to prioritize communities on a rank order basis. Rather, communities (or landscapes) should be sorted into three, broad categories or zones of risk: high, medium, and low. Each state, in collaboration with its local partners, will develop the specific criteria it will use to sort communities or landscapes into the three categories. NASF recommends using the publication “Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Hazard Assessment Methodology” developed by the National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Protection Program (circa 1998) as a reference guide. (This program, which has since evolved into the Firewise Program, is under the oversight of the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG)). At minimum, states should consider the following factors when assessing the relative degree of exposure each community (landscape) faces.
 - **Risk:** Using historic fire occurrence records and other factors, assess the anticipated probability of a wildfire ignition.
 - **Hazard:** Assess the fuel conditions surrounding the community using a methodology such as fire condition class, or [other] process.

- **Values Protected:** Evaluate the human values associated with the community or landscape, such as homes, businesses, and community infrastructure (e.g. water systems, utilities, transportation systems, critical care facilities, schools, manufacturing and industrial sites, and high value commercial timber lands).
 - **Protection Capabilities:** Assess the wildland fire protection capabilities of the agencies and local fire departments with jurisdiction.
4. Prioritize by project not by community. Annually prioritize projects within each state using the collaborative process defined in the national, interagency MOU “For the Development of a Collaborative Fuels Treatment Program”. Assign the highest priorities to projects that will provide the greatest benefits either on the landscape or to communities. Attempt to properly sequence treatments on the landscape by working first around and within communities, and then moving further out into the surrounding landscape. This will require:
 - First, focus on the zone of highest overall risk but consider projects in all zones. Identify a set of projects that will effectively reduce the level of risk to communities within the zone.
 - Second, determining the community’s willingness and readiness to actively participate in an identified project.
 - Third, determining the willingness and ability of the owner of the surrounding land to undertake, and maintain, a complementary project.
 - Last, set priorities by looking for projects that best meet the three criteria above. It is important to note that projects with the greatest potential to reduce risk to communities and the landscape may not be those in the highest risk zone, particularly if either the community or the surrounding landowner is not willing or able to actively participate.
 5. It is important, and necessary, that we be able to demonstrate a level of accomplishment that justifies to Congress the value of continuing the current level of appropriations for the National Fire Plan. Although appealing to appropriators and others, it is not likely that many communities (if any) will ever be removed from the list of communities at risk. Even after treatment, all communities will remain at some, albeit reduced, level of risk. However, by using a science-based system for measuring relative risk, we can likely show that, after treatment (or a series of treatments), communities are at “*reduced risk*”.

Similarly, scattered, individual homes that complete projects to create defensible space could be “counted” as “households at reduced risk”. This would be a way to report progress in reducing risk to scattered homes in areas of low priority for large-scale fuels treatment projects.

Using the concept described above, the NASF believes it is possible to accurately assess the relative risk that communities face from wildland fire. Recognizing that the condition of the vegetation (fuel) on the landscape is dynamic, assessments and re-assessments must be done on a state-by-state basis, using a process that allows for the integration of local knowledge, conditions, and circumstances, with science-based national guidelines. We must remember that it is not only important to lower the risk to communities, but once the risk has been reduced, to maintain those communities at a reduced risk.

Further, it is essential that both the assessment process and the prioritization of projects be done collaboratively, with all local agencies with fire protection jurisdiction – federal, state, local, and tribal – taking an active role.

1.1.3.4 Healthy Forests Restoration Act

On December 3, 2003, President Bush signed into law the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to reduce the threat of destructive wildfires while upholding environmental standards and encouraging early public input during review and planning processes. The legislation is based on sound science and helps further the President's Healthy Forests Initiative pledge to care for America's forests and rangelands, reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to communities, help save the lives of firefighters and citizens, and protect threatened and endangered species.

Among other things the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA):

- Strengthens public participation in developing high priority projects;
- Reduces the complexity of environmental analysis allowing federal land agencies to use the best science available to actively manage land under their protection;
- Creates a pre-decisional objections process encouraging early public participation in project planning; and
- Issues clear guidance for court action challenging HFRA projects.

The Ada County Wildland-Urban Interface Wildfire Mitigation Plan is developed to adhere to the principles of the HFRA while providing recommendations consistent with the policy document which should assist the federal land management agencies (US Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management) with implementing wildfire mitigation projects in Ada County that incorporate public involvement and the input from a wide spectrum of fire and emergency services providers in the region.

1.1.4 Local Guidelines and Integration with Other Efforts

1.1.4.1 Ada County Comprehensive Growth and Development Plan

The Ada County Comprehensive Growth and Development Plan (1997) is a guide that establishes goals and objectives to help the County grow and develop. The Ada County Comprehensive Plan includes a forecast of conditions that are anticipated to occur within the next twenty-five-year period, 2000 to 2025. The Plan addresses and includes all 14 comprehensive planning components of the "Idaho Local Planning Act of 1975" as supplemented and amended.

Planning is an ongoing process. Conditions and priorities change; consequently the plan will be reviewed regularly and revised when necessary. The 13 planning components included in the Ada County Comprehensive Growth and Development Plan include:

1. Private Property Rights
2. Population and Growth
3. Economic Development
4. School Facilities and Transportation
5. Land Use
6. Natural Resources
7. Hazardous Areas
8. Public Services, Facilities, and Utilities

9. Transportation Recreation and Tourism
10. Special Areas or Sites
11. Housing
12. Community Design
13. Implementation

Within each chapter of the comprehensive plan are goals and objectives, which help establish development guidelines and public policy. Goals are defined as statements, which indicate a general aim or purpose to be achieved. Goals reflect countywide values. Objectives are defined as guidelines, which establish a definite course to guide present and future decisions. The Ada County Comprehensive Plan is directed toward all land within the County including Federal, State, Public and Private lands.

This Wildland-Urban Interface Wildfire Mitigation Plan will “dove-tail” with the County’s Comprehensive Plan during its development and implementation to insure that the goals and objectives of each are integrated together. In many sections of this document, direct reference will be made to specific recommendations that are amplified or enhanced in this document. This planning effort fully adopts the goals and objectives of the County’s Comprehensive Plan.

1.1.4.2 Ada County Wildfire Mitigation Planning Effort and Philosophy

The goal of this planning process is to integrate components of the National Fire Plan, the Idaho Statewide Implementation Strategy, the Healthy Forests Restoration Act, and the requirements of FEMA for a county-wide Fire Mitigation Plan; a component of the County’s All Hazards Mitigation Plan. This effort will utilize the best and most appropriate science from all partners, the integration of local and regional knowledge about wildfire risks and fire behavior, while meeting the needs of local citizens, the regional economy, the significance of this region to the rest of Idaho and the Inland West.

1.1.4.2.1 Mission Statement

To make Ada County residents, communities, state agencies, local governments, and businesses less vulnerable to the negative effects of wildland fires through the effective administration of wildfire hazard mitigation grant programs, hazard risk assessments, wise and efficient fuels treatments, and a coordinated approach to mitigation policy through federal, state, regional, and local planning efforts. Our combined prioritization will be the protection of people, structures, infrastructure, and unique ecosystems that contribute to our way of life and the sustainability of the local and regional economy.

1.1.4.2.2 Vision Statement

Institutionalize and promote a countywide wildfire hazard mitigation ethic through leadership, professionalism, and excellence, leading the way to a safe, sustainable Ada County.

1.1.4.2.3 Goals

- To reduce the area of WUI land burned and losses experienced because of wildfires where these fires threaten communities in the wildland-urban interface
- Prioritize the protection of people, structures, infrastructure, and unique ecosystems that contribute to our way of life and the sustainability of the local and regional economy

- Educate communities about the unique challenges of wildfire in the wildland-urban interface (WUI)
- Establish mitigation priorities and develop mitigation strategies in Ada County
- Strategically locate and plan fuel reduction projects
- Provide recommendations for alternative treatment methods, such as herbicide treatments, fuel reduction techniques, and disposal or removal of treated slash and brush
- Meet or exceed the requirements of the National Fire Plan and FEMA for a County level Fire Mitigation Plan